

REMARKS IN RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION:

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicated that claims 13, 15, 19, and 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgement of allowable subject matter. In light of Examiner's acknowledgement, claims 13, 15, 19 and 29 have been cancelled and the limitations of each have been incorporated into respective independent claims. Specifically, the limitations of claim 13 (including the limitations of intervening claim 12) have been incorporated into independent claim 6. Likewise, claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 31; claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 32; and claim 29 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 33. Thus, claims 6 and 31–33 are in condition for allowance as previously indicated by the Examiner. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate allowance of claims 6 and 31–33 in the next paper from the office.

REMARKS REGARDING AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 6, and 25 have been amended so that the scope and language of the claims is clearer and more precise in defining what the Applicant considers to be the invention for the purposes of appeal. Claims 31–33 have been added as previous claims 15, 19, and 29 rewritten in independent form. Claims 12, 13, 15, 19, and 29 have been cancelled. Support for the above amendments can be found at least in the original specification, claims, and drawing as no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended are clearly distinct and patentable over the prior art of record and therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner enter these requested amendments and that all claims be allowed.

FIRST REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1–9, 14, 16–18, 20–28, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,491,986 to White (“White”). Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Independent claim 1 as amended is directed to holding a setting within a mounting area of a body and requires that a module be slidably coupled on the body “from underneath the setting.” White discloses a setting that is mounted onto two parallel bars. A resilient retainer slide is then inserted into a slot in the sides of the setting. The resilient retainer slide is positioned over tabs on the setting and underneath the two parallel bars to allegedly secure the setting to the bars. However, White fails to teach slidably coupling a module to the body from underneath the setting, but instead discloses inserting the slide into the side of setting. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 1 as anticipated by White.

Claims 2–5 depend from claim 1, and, thus, incorporate each limitation therein. Therefore, claims 2–5 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 2–5 as anticipated by White.

The limitations of previous claims 12 and 13 have been incorporated into amended claim 6 to place claim 6 in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner, and allowance of claim 6 is requested.

Claims 7–9, 14, 16–18, and 20–24 depend from claim 6, and, thus, incorporate each limitation therein. Claims 7–9, 14, 16–18, and 20–24 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 6. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 7–9, 14, 16–18, and 20–24 as anticipated by White.

Like independent claim 1, independent claim 25 as amended requires slidable coupling in a direction underneath the setting. As discussed above, White discloses a setting that is secured to two parallel bars by a resilient retainer slide that is inserted into a slot in the side of the setting. Thus, White does not teach this limitation. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 25 as anticipated by White.

Claims 26–28 and 30 depend from claim 25 and, thus, incorporate each limitation therein. Claims 26–28 and 30 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 25. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 26–28 and 30 as anticipated by White.

SECOND REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1, 2, 4–8, 12, 16, 20, 22–27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,951,706 to Powers (“Powers”). Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 as amended requires that a module be slidably coupled on the body “from underneath the setting.” Powers discloses a mounting plate that has an opening allegedly adapted to holding a setting in all but one direction. Powers further

discloses the use of two plates that are slid along the top of the mounting plate to contact the sides of the setting. The two plates are allegedly adapted to retain the setting against the mounting plate. However, the plates, even if considered as modules, are not coupled on the body from underneath the setting. Thus, Powers fails to teach this limitation of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 1 as anticipated by Powers.

Claims 2 and 4–5 depend from claim 1, and, thus, incorporate each limitation therein. Claims 2 and 4–5 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 2 and 4–5 as anticipated by Powers.

As discussed above, independent claim 6 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of claims 12 and 13 to place claim 6 in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner, and allowance of claim 6 is requested.

Claims 7–8, 16, 20, and 22–24 depend from claim 6, and, thus, incorporate each limitation therein. Claims 7–8, 16, 20, and 22–24 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 6. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 7–8, 16, 20, and 22–24 as anticipated by Powers.

As discussed above, independent claim 25 as amended requires slidable coupling in a direction underneath the setting. As discussed above, Powers discloses a setting that is secured to the mounting plate by two plates slide along the top of the mounting plate to contact the sides of the setting. Thus, Powers does not teach this limitation. For at least these reasons, Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 25 as anticipated by Powers.

Claims 26–27 and 30 depend from claim 25 and, thus, incorporate each limitation therein.

Claims 26–27 and 30 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 25.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 26–27 and 30 as anticipated by Powers.

THIRD REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Powers. Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 6 and thus, incorporate each limitation therein. As discussed above, the Examiner has already indicated that claim 6 as amended would be allowable, and claims 10 and 11 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 6. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner also reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 10 and 11 as anticipated by Powers.

Given the above, Applicant requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of claims 1–11, 14, 16–18, 20–28, and 30–33 in the next paper from the Office. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to discuss any issues or questions raised by this paper.

Serial No.: 10/649,309
Confirmation No.: 5404
Applicant: Ronald W. Hartgrove
Atty. Ref.: 11149.0030.NPUS00

Respectfully submitted,


Rodney K. Caldwell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,152
Tel. 713-787-1441
Date: August 25, 2005